



Conserving Forests through sustainable forest-based Enterprise Support, in Tanzania (CoForEST)



Research Workshop Proceedings

Held at TAFORI in Morogoro, Tanzania

11th to 12th April 2022

List of Acronyms

CBFM	Community Based Forest Management
CoForEST	Conserving Forests through sustainable forest-based Enterprise Support in Tanzania
DED	District Executive Director
DFO	District Forest Officer
FBD	Forestry and Beekeeping Division
FMU	Forest Management Unit
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
FORVAC	Forestry and Value Chains Development Programme
GN	Government Notice
LGA	Local Government Authorities
MCDI	Mpingo Conservation and Development Initiative
MJUMITA	Mtandano wa Jamii wa Usimamizi wa Misitu Tanzania
MNRT	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
NAFORMA	National Forest Resources and Monitoring and Assessment
NFSS	National Forest Stewardship Standards
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
PES	Payment for Ecosystem Services
PORALG	President's Office Regional Administration and Local Government
RNRO	Regional Natural Resource Officer
TAFORI	Tanzania Forest Research Institute
TFCG	Tanzania Forest Conservation Group
TFS	Tanzania Forest Services Agency
TFWG	Tanzania Forest Working Group
REDD	Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SUA	Sokoine University of Agriculture
UDSM	University of Dar es Salaam
VLFR	Village Land Forest Reserve

Table of Content

List of Acronyms	2
Table of Content	3
1.0 Introduction and background	5
1.2 Introduction.....	5
1.3 Objectives of the workshop.....	5
1.4 Organization of the workshop	5
1.5 Workshop Agenda/ Program.....	6
1.6 Key participants.....	7
2.1.0 Overview.....	8
2.1.1 Brief overview of TFCG and the CoForEST Project by Charles Leonard, CoForEST Project Manager	8
2.1.2 Brief overview of the CoForEST research programme by Ewald Emil, Monitoring and Research Officer	8
2.1.3 Opening Remarks by Selebon John, Project Focal Point, FBD.....	8
2.2.0 Ecological monitoring programme	10
2.2.1 Research on regeneration and Development of Ecological Monitoring Programme by Dr. Wilson Mugasha, FORCONSULT-SUA	10
2.2.2 Discussion after presentation on Ecological Monitoring Programme and Regeneration study	11
2.3.0 Gender and CBFM	13
2.3.1 Research on Gender in CBFM by Prof. John Jeckoniah.....	13
2.3.2 Discussion after presentation on gender.....	15
2.4.0 CBFM and governance	16
2.4.1 Presentation on Governance Challenges by Dr. Kilemo, Envex Consulting.....	16
2.4.2 Discussion after presentation on good governance challenges.....	18
2.5.0 Charcoal Certification	19
2.5.1 Research on Charcoal Certification by Dr. Severin Kalonga, EFC Ltd	19
2.5.2 Discussion after presentation on charcoal certification.....	21
2.6.0 CBFM Financing	23
2.6.1 Research on CBFM Financing by Dr. Perfect Mrema, UDSM	23
2.6.2 Discussion after presentation on CBFM Financing.....	26
2.7.0 Impact of GN 417	27
2.7.1 Presentation on Empirical Evidence of the Impact of GN 417 by Cassian Sianga, TFWG.....	27
2.7.2 Discussion after presentation on Empirical Evidence of the Impact of GN 417	28
2.8.0 Remarks from the Workshop Participants	29
2.8.1 DNRO, Kilosa district.....	29
2.8.2 District Land and Natural Resource Officer, Morogoro district.....	29

2.8.3 District Planning Officer, Mvomero district	29
2.8.4 District Planning Officer, Liwale district	29
2.8.5 District Forest Officer, Ruangwa district	29
2.8.6 Representative, Nachingwea district	30
2.8.7 Representative, MCDI	30
2.8.8 Representative, TAFORI	30
2.8.9 RNRO, Lindi	30
2.8.10 RNRO, Iringa	30
2.8.11 TFS, Morogoro	31
2.8.12 Representative, MNRT/FBD	31
2.8.13 Remarks from TFCG by Nike Doggart, TFCG Technical Advisor	31
2.8.14 Remarks from TFCG by Charles Leonard, Project Manager on behalf of TFCG Assistant Director	32
2.8.15 Closing remarks, Sanford Kway, PORALG	32
Annex 1: Proposed action plan, Charcoal Certification	33
Annex 2. List of participants	39
Annex 3. Photos	42

1.0 Introduction and background

1.2 Introduction

With Financial Support from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), the Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG) in partnership with the Tanzania Community Forest Conservation Network (MJUMITA) are implementing the project 'Conserving Forests through sustainable, forest-based Enterprise Support in Tanzania' – CoForEST. The project goal is to achieve a sustainable, pro-community natural forest management that transforms the economics and governance of the forest products value chains and contributes to climate change mitigation and adaptation.

The project is designed to achieve its overall goal through three inter-related Outcomes:

Outcome 1: The capacity of national, regional and local authorities and community members is strengthened to implement and scale-up CBFM in ways that diversify livelihoods and reduce deforestation.

Outcome 2: A supportive policy framework and financing mechanism for community based forest management and sustainable natural forest based enterprises is in place

Outcome 3: Research and learning institutions in Tanzania are generating new knowledge about enterprise oriented CBFM and are integrating this in student learning.

The three-year project includes a research component that seeks to generate new knowledge about enterprise-oriented CBFM through a programme of research on CBFM and forest-based enterprises under Outcome 3. Researches implemented under this component were recommended during stakeholder consultation process when developing phase three of the project and contributes to all the three outcomes

1.3 Objectives of the workshop

The overarching objective of the workshop was to bring together project implementers, partners and other key stakeholders for the purpose of sharing and discussing findings and recommendations of the research conducted through the CoForEST project. The event aimed at obtaining inputs from stakeholders to fine-tune the findings and improve implementation of the recommendations provided by the researches.

In line with the main objective above, this workshop was an opportunity for the project and its partners to share research findings with the public through media.

1.4 Organization of the workshop

In order to achieve the workshop objectives, the event was organized as a 2-day session (from 11th to 12th April 2022) comprised of presentations and discussions. This report serves as the proceedings for this workshop.

1.5 Workshop Agenda/ Program

Time	Event	Responsible
08.00– 08.30	Arrival and registration of the participants	MRO
08.30 – 08.45	Welcoming and setting the scene	MRO
08.45 – 09.00	Welcome note	TFCG-Assistant Director
09.00 – 09.30	Opening remarks	PO RALG
09.30 – 10.00	A brief overview of the CoForEST Research Programme	MRO
10.00 – 10.30	Health Break	All
10.30 – 12.30	Presentation on the research findings (monitoring work in the Phase 2 villages, and the national regeneration study) Questions and Discussion	Dr. Wilson Mugasha (FORCONSULT-SUA)
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch break	All
13.30 – 15.30	Presentation on the research findings (CBFM and Gender) Questions and Discussion	Prof. John Jeckoniah and Prof. Suzana Augustino (FORCONSULT-SUA)
15.30 – 16.30	Presentation on the research findings (CBFM governance challenges) Questions and Discussion	Dr. Dominico B. Kilemo (Envex)
16.30 – 16.45	Remarks from TFCG	TFCG Technical Advisor
16.45 – 17.00	Closing Remarks	FBD
08.00– 08.30	Arrival and registration of the participants (Day two)	MRO
08.30 – 08.35	Recap/ Over view of day one	MRO
08.35 – 10.00	Presentation on the research findings (Charcoal Certification) Questions and Discussions	Dr. Severin Kalonga (EFC Ltd)
10.00 – 10.30	Health Break	All

Time	Event	Responsible
10.30 – 12.30	Presentation on the research findings (CBFM Financing) Questions and Discussion	Dr. Aloyce S. Hepelwa and Dr. Joseph P. Mrema (UDSM)
12.30 – 14.00	Presentation on the research findings (Charcoal production techniques and plan for the next research) Questions and Discussion	Prof. Eliakimu Zahabu and Dr. Bernadol Manyanga (FORCONSULT SUA)
14.00 – 15.00	Lunch break	All
15.00 – 16.30	Presentation on the research findings (Empirical evidence of the impact of GN 417 in CBFM)	Mr. Cassian Sianga (TFWG)
16.30 – 17.00	Remarks from the workshop participants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LGAs • FORVAC • MCDI • SULEDO • TAFORI • RNRO-Morogoro, Iringa and Lindi 	Workshop participants
17.00 – 17.10	Remarks from TFCG TA	TFCG Technical Advisor
17.10 – 17.20	Remarks from TFCG	Assistant Director, TFCG
17.20 – 17.30	Closing Remarks	PORALG

1.6 Key participants

Participants of this workshop were from Local Government Authorities (Morogoro, Kilosa, Movomero, Kilolo, Liwale, Ruangwa and Nachingwea), Regional Secretariats (Lindi, Morogoro and Iringa), Tanzania Forest Service Agency (TFS), FORVAC, NGOs including Tanzania Natural Resource Forum (TNRF), Mpingo Conservation and Development Initiative (MCDI), Mtandao wa Jamii wa Usimaizi wa Misitua Tanzania (MJUMITA), Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG), Research and Academic Institutions (SUA, UDSM and TAFORI) and representatives from the media

2.1.0 Overview

2.1.1 Brief overview of TFCG and the CoForEST Project by Charles Leonard, CoForEST Project Manager

The Project Manager provided a brief overview of the Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG) and the CoForEST Project. In his remarks, he pointed out that TFCG is a non-governmental organization focusing on conservation of natural forests. It was started in 1985 and its headquarters are in Dar es Salaam. TFCG has been implementing various projects in different areas in partnership with MJUMITA and other organizations including the government. The mission of TFCG is to reduce rural poverty by supporting conservation and management of biodiversity of globally important forests in Tanzania for the benefit of the present and future generations. TFCG envisage a world in which Tanzanians and the rest of humanity enjoy the diverse benefits from well conserved, high biodiversity forests. In order to achieve this, there are five programmes i.e. conservation, research, advocacy, communication and community development. The CoForEST project is implemented with TFCG and MJUMITA in collaboration with other partners including the government. The project is funded by Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC). The first phase of the project started in March 2012 to November 2015 and involved 10 villages in Kilosa district. The second phase of the project started in December 2015 to November 2019 by involving 30 villages in three districts (20 villages in Kilosa, 5 villages in Morogoro and 5 villages in Mvomero). The third phase started in December 2019 and will end in November 2022. In this phase, 4 new districts were added i.e 3 districts in Lindi (Nachingwea, Liwale, Ruangwa) and 1 district in Iringa (Kilolo). The overall objective of the project is 'sustainable, pro-community natural forest management that transforms the economics and governance of forest product value chains and contributes to climate change mitigation and adaptation'. The project has 3 outcomes focusing on capacity building, communication, and research.

2.1.2 Brief overview of the CoForEST research programme by Ewald Emil, Monitoring and Research Officer

This presentation provided an overview of the project research programme. The overall objective of the research component is that: research and learning institutions generate new knowledge about enterprise oriented CBFM and integrate in student learning. The component includes an international dimension particularly through the African Forest Forum (AFF). The research topics were identified as research priorities during the stakeholder consultation process when developing Phase three of the project. Four research topics i.e Charcoal certification, Charcoal Production Techniques, Gender in CBFM and CBFM Financing were recommended by stakeholders. The presentation provided an overview of the status of implementation. In addition to that, the presentation highlighted participants on the progress of implementation of the ecological monitoring programme and development of the socio-economic monitoring system.

2.1.3 Opening Remarks by Selebon John, Project Focal Point, FBD

The opening remarks during the official opening of the research workshop were provided by Mr. Selebon John who is a focal point officer for the project from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism-Forestry and Beekeeping Division. He started by thanking TFCG and MJUMITA for organizing the workshop, researchers who implemented the research, participants and TAFORI for hosting the event. In his remarks, he pointed out that, research is important in generating new knowledge needed in informing implementation process and decision making at different levels. He added that, the workshop will provide an opportunity for participants to hear about the findings, provide inputs to the studies, discuss on ways to

package the findings / recommendations and agree on strategies and responsibilities of the various stakeholders in implementing the recommendations including areas for further research. MNRT as the ministry responsible for natural resources among other things, we see that, this is a relevant meeting as it will inform policy and decision making processes. Having said that, he declared the research workshop officially opened.

2.2.0 Ecological monitoring programme

2.2.1 Research on regeneration and Development of Ecological Monitoring Programme by Dr. Wilson Mugasha, FORCONSULT-SUA

Presentation is available at: <http://www.tfcg.org/coforest-ecological-monitoring-of-cbfm-areas-2022/>

In 2020 (Year 1) the CoForEST project engaged FORCONSULT-SUA to develop participatory ecological monitoring programme for miombo woodland under productive, community-based forest management.

Specifically, the assignment intended to:

1. Train villagers through VNRC on data collection using mobile devices;
2. Collect ecological monitoring data; and
3. Upload the collected field data in the online storage system

In 2021 the project consulted FORCONSULT-SUA to implement a research on regeneration in miombo woodland. The study complements the ongoing ecological monitoring work being implemented in the project villages. Ecological monitoring baseline data collected in 2019 and 2020 from the CoForEST project areas, contributed to the results of this research. Objectives of the Year 2 study were as follows:

Objective 1. To determine post-deforestation regeneration trends and patterns in areas of woodland on village land.

- 1a. To identify trends and patterns in post-deforestation land cover, including the proportion of land that does / does not, regenerate towards forest.
- 1b To identify key determinants of post-deforestation regeneration rates (biomass, basal area and volume increments), in areas with different land use histories.
- 1c To compare post-deforestation changes in tree species diversity with land use history.

Objective 2. To estimate the amount of charcoal that could be produced sustainably from woodland on village land under different regeneration and harvesting scenarios.

Objective 3. To estimate carbon sequestration rates from regeneration in woodland on village land.

The research was implemented by Dr. Wilson Mugasha, Senior Lecturer, Department of Forest Resources Assessment and Management, Sokoine University of Agriculture (Lead Consultant) and Aloyce Mpiri, Researcher, Tanzania Forestry Research Institute (Team Member)

As presented in the workshop, data collection in the field has been completed and analysis is on progress. Preliminary findings presented during the research workshop:

- on average, deforestation has exceeded regeneration by ~ 414,000 hectares per year over the last 34 years. It is likely that this is not evenly distributed and instead indicates higher rates of recent deforestation
- time and vegetation type are key determinants of biomass accumulation while the impact of human activities is less clear

- species richness in regenerating woodland / bush land / forest areas is affected by time and vegetation type, as well as by other factors including cultivation, livestock and fire.

2.2.2 Discussion after presentation on Ecological Monitoring Programme and Regeneration study

Question: How can the monitoring tool be applied; is it ownership based, for example can the monitoring tool be used in forests which are under district councils / central government; forest operations may differ according to the forest management regime and objectives; so can this tool be used in such circumstances?



Response: The tool covers multiple forest management regimes; variables that are monitored by this tool are similar to those used by NAFORMA, and basically the tool assesses regeneration, re-growth, threats etc, the difference would be on the scale (village level) and stakeholders involved; other stakeholders such as TFS could use the tool in the areas set for production as well as forests under local government authorities.

Question: Is the monitoring system integrative; apart from timber and charcoal production, other livelihood activities (beekeeping, climate smart agriculture etc) are also important in enhancing sustainability of the forest resources; so the tool should be able to monitor this.

Response: The tool did not include other livelihoods; though harvesting could affect availability of other forest products such as mushrooms, beekeeping etc in the harvested plots, but it should be noted that, village forests are divided into Forest Management Units (FMUs) for different purposes whereas charcoal is produced in the areas set aside for charcoal production, there are FMUs for other purposes including beekeeping and other livelihood activities.

Question: How do we monitor value addition and -to what level should we do it; for example if we monitor value addition in the charcoal value chain; where do we end, i.e. do we monitor to the stage when the product leaves the village, or do we monitor beyond that e.g -up to the market; this is important because feedback from the monitoring process will inform decisions on how to improve

Response: This is a very important point that needs consideration; we could discuss and see how this can be embedded in the existing monitoring tools; though currently the focus is on ecological monitoring.

Question: Was the national regeneration study conducted in village lands or in village land forest reserves; regeneration has been presented in general without considering forms of land use; it is important that land uses are considered; the study would be more informative / useful if deforestation is categorized based on the forms of land uses (government forest reserves, village land forest reserves, non CBFM forests on village land etc); without categorizing -it might be difficult to develop appropriate approaches to address deforestation in the affected areas. Nevertheless, it may not be realistic to assess deforestation in the

areas set aside for agriculture (as one of the forms of land use) or areas set aside for grazing etc particularly in the villages with land use plans; other land uses are part of the equation and need to be considered while calculating deforestation.

Response: The study was conducted in the village lands and included both village land forest reserves and non CBFM forests in the village lands; categorizing deforestation is a valid point because deforestation may vary depending on the type of forest management regime; this will add value to the study

Question: Based on your analysis, what species seemed to regenerate and what species disappeared from the harvested plots; were the harvested plots affected by invasive species?

Response: Analysis is on progress, however in most cases regeneration was from coppice and root suckers; field observation suggests that species will be more or less the same. Once the analysis is done it will be possible to know if there are any changes that have occurred in terms of species diversity / composition. Also, since the research included other types of forests such as coastal forests it could be possible to find something different.

Question: For the purpose of sustainability, how is the monitoring system organized so that its implementation could continue even after the project has phased out; it is indicated in your presentation that, the participatory monitoring system will be linked with TAFORI who will assist in data analysis and other technical issues; have we capacitated LGAs so that could also take active role in the implementation of the monitoring system?

Response: So far LGAs have not been capacitated in data analysis, training conducted to the district staff was on data capturing and on how to upload the data to the monitoring database; However, capacity building to LGAs on data analysis and management will be important as they will be a link between the villages and TAFORI.

Comment: Conversion of forest lands into farmlands involves removing tree resources to allow crop cultivation; unfortunately this process has not been done properly, for example experience in Lindi and elsewhere show that in most cases trees are burnt after clear fell. Such trees could have been used for other purposes as part of value addition; however because of the bureaucratic procedures in obtaining utilization permits farmers opt to burn them. This problem needs to be address to encourage farmers to utilize tree resources after clearing their farms.

Question: In the plots where measurements were taken, some of them were left as agricultural fallows; were there any other interference after were left as fallows? It is important to know what happened at the time of fallow.

Response: There were some sort of disturbances including livestock grazing in the areas left as fallows; partly that explains why there are some variations within the fallows.

Questions: What were the assumptions and limitations of this research?

Response: One of the limitations was to find respondents who knew history of the sampled plots; this was one of the biggest challenges; in most cases it was difficult to get respondents who could tell exactly what happened in the respective plots. Also there were some issues with satellite images, including availability and interpretation of the images i.e good satellite images were not available for some of the years and also some of the images looked like forests but turned out to be agricultural crops, during ground-truthing

Question: The way deforestation is defined in this context (without considering other land uses); do we think it will be possible that it will decrease? Livelihood activities and development projects require land as well, and with increasing population, obviously, more land will be required; how do we re-define deforestation to account for other land uses? The way it is now, it gives an overall figure of the forest loss without accounting for unavoidable losses such as development projects (road, power supply, housing, etc).

Response: Despite the fact that the figure which indicates deforestation does not account for unavoidable losses such as infrastructure development etc but in the overall deforestation is on the higher side; if the trend continues like this, it is certain that forests will be depleted after a certain period of time; rate of deforestation is alarming and for sustainability purposes, we need to see how we can address this situation.

2.3.0 Gender and CBFM

2.3.1 Research on Gender in CBFM by Prof. John Jeckoniah

Presentation is available at: <http://www.tfcg.org/coforest-gender-research-2022/>

In 2020 (Year 1), the CoForEST project supported research on the nature of gender disparities in CBFM. The research addressed eight research objectives that had been prioritised in a multi-stakeholder consultation process. These broadly sought to understand the gender disparities in CBFM and forest-based enterprises. The eight objectives were to:

1. Evaluate available channels / spaces for different social groups (women, men, youth, etc) to participate in CBFM and forest-based enterprises (1)
2. Examine gender disparities in the distribution of benefits from CBFM (2)
3. Examine key drivers for gender disparities (3)
4. Explore strategies to address gender disparities in the distribution of benefits from CBFM (4)
5. Examine networks of gender involved in forestry (4)
6. Examine approaches for integrating gender in village level governance (4)
7. Generate evidence-based recommendations for gender mainstreaming in community based forest management and natural forest based enterprises (5)
8. Propose action research on developing guideline/checklists around integrating gender issues in establishing CBFM (6).

Key conclusions from the 2020 CoForEST research on gender and CBFM were that:

- gender disparities exist in CBFM roles and responsibilities and these reflect traditional gender roles with women being marginalised in decision-making processes;
- men have been more successful than women in capturing the benefits from CBFM and forest-based enterprises;
- barriers to women benefitting from CBFM and forest-based enterprises include the reluctance of men to share household and childcare duties, limiting women's available time and labour for CBFM activities; - promoting women's right to engage in CBFM has increased women's participation but has also increased social tensions;
- there is a need for guidelines on integrating gender in CBFM, with an emphasis on inclusivity in the process of changing gender relations; and

- village councils do not have the capacity to address gender disparities and external support is needed to foster more equitable CBFM.

The study included recommendations for action research linking with the Project Document recommendation to carry out research into strategies to address gender disparities. Action research is defined as *'a form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of their own practices, their understanding of these practices, and the situations in which the practices are carried out. The central aim in action research is change, 'and the emphasis is on problem-solving in whatever way is appropriate'. It is about people 'thinking for themselves and making their own choices, asking themselves what they should do and accepting the consequences of their own actions' (Smith, 20171)*.

The action research topics recommended in the 2020 CoForEST gender study included research on the following:

- i. Overcoming the economic, social, cultural, political and legal factors that limit women and other disadvantaged groups from influencing CBFM and accessing CBFM benefits;
- ii. The development of CBFM enterprises for livelihood improvement for women and other disadvantaged groups, with an emphasis on sustainable harvesting, processing, value-addition and marketing;
- iii. Changing labour networks and the production processes to benefit women and marginalised groups;
- iv. The use of enabling technology for gender empowerment in CBFM-related value chains;
- v. Gender and climate change in CBFM areas – mitigation, coping and adaptation strategies, access to emerging issues like REDD+ and co-benefits.

In response to this, in 2021 the CoForEST Project engaged FORCONSULT-SUA to undertake research on gender with the following objectives:

- To contribute new knowledge on strategies to address gender disparities in community-based forest management and sustainable forest-based enterprises, including charcoal production.
- To contribute to one or more of the recommended topics listed above and generate practicable recommendations to achieve greater gender equity in CBFM and sustainable forest product value chains.

The research was implemented by Prof. John Jeckoniah, Senior Lecturer and Researcher from Sokoine University of Agriculture, Department of Development Studies (Lead Consultant) and Prof. Suzan Augustino, Senior Lecturer and Researcher from Sokoine University of Agriculture, College of Forestry, Wildlife and Tourism, Department of Forest Engineering and Wood Sciences (Team member)

Key conclusions and recommendations from the 2021 research were presented during the workshop. To overcome gender inequalities in CBFM, there is a need:

- for regular provision of education on gender and sustainable management of the CBFM;
- to establish secured markets for CBFM products including value addition and linkages with proper communication;
- to design the institutional frameworks for CBFM and forest-related policy-making, formation of groups, networks, and inclusive forest-related platforms, awareness-building actions on their role in forestry value chains;
- LGAs should advocate for enforcement of legal framework that recognize community-based tenure, including specific provisions on respecting and protecting women's rights e.g., village land use plans and contracts (related to concessions, PES schemes).
- devise gender parity rules for local councils, cooperatives and producer organizations, to open up greater access by women to key decision making arenas
- to prepare policy fora to inform relevant sectors for mainstreaming key issues in policies, strategies and workplans;
- to prepare popular publications such as posters, newsletters and leaflets to share key information with other stakeholders including local communities;
- and to collaborate with research and academic institutions to disseminate information during workshops and seminars to wider audience.

The empirical evidence provided in our research indicate the relationship and impact of poverty in the initiatives to bring equality, it informs the CBFM policy makers and practitioners.

Recommendations for further research:

- Gender Capacity building in other CBFM related resources: sustainable production, marketing and value addition
- Strengthening CBFM products marketing system – linking organized gender producer groups to sustainable markets
- Support to enhance gender adaptive capacities to climate change impacts

2.3.2 Discussion after presentation on gender

Question: Connection between gender in CBFM and climate change has not featured sufficiently in the presentation; did the analysis include the aspect of gender versus climate change?

Response: The presentation has not covered much information on gender and climate change; however the main report has more information on this aspect. With regard to that, the coping mechanism between women and men differ, where in most cases the workload increases to women.

Question: To what extent gender empowerment interventions have included men; because experience shows that in most cases gender interventions have not included men sufficiently; how could this be addressed to avoid family conflicts?

Response: In the African context, men are the custodians of decisions at the family level; it is important to ensure that men are not left behind. There should be some way to reach men including through tailor made approaches and training so that they can recognize and support positive changes in their families and societies. If men are left behind the possibility of emerging family conflicts is apparent. We need affirmative action i.e. women inclusion in the village institutions etc; including mind set transformation in the family level and in the

society so that empowerment results into positive changes. Women empowerment should include recognition of our cultural and social values.

Findings showed that, customs and traditions are affecting involvement of women in CBFM and forest based enterprises, for example timber harvesting is viewed as men's livelihood activity. However, through capacity building and empowerment, women involvement in such livelihood activities has increased. Women's engagement in village saving and lending schemes increased their possibility of engaging in forestry enterprises using loans obtained from their lending groups.

Comment: It is important to strike a balance when empowering women, the study could as well examine advantages and disadvantages/challenges which emerge as a result of women empowerment. NFI Strategy states that, by 2031 there should be at-least ten programmes that engage women, men, youths and special groups; such programmes could be on forest enterprises, awareness on gender, gender balance between women, men, youths and disadvantaged etc. This research could inform development of such programmes.

Response: We need to maintain a delicate balance between men and women; in the overall the position of men when it comes to income, decision making and control over resources is relatively higher as compared to women. This situation has resulted into implementation of affirmative actions aiming at empowering women to improve their position. It is difficult to know the stage we have reached so far, however, it is important to pick all the cultural and social values that are of beneficial to our societies while empowering women through various affirmative interventions and that they should know that such values are not replaced.

2.4.0 CBFM and governance

2.4.1 Presentation on Governance Challenges by Dr. Kilemo, Envex Consulting

Presentation is available at: <http://www.tfcg.org/coforest-cbfm-research-2022/>

CBFM has contributed to local government revenue collection and to supporting social services such as health care, education and infrastructure. However, CBFM has faced a number of challenges. Outlined below, are four key challenges that have emerged in the implementation process

- Skills shortages among VNRC members as a result of frequent turnover of VNRC members. As a result, the collective skills and knowledge of VNRCs risks being eroded over time thereby undermining VLFR management effectiveness. New approaches are needed that would ensure skills are transferred to incoming VNRC members.
- Impact on VLFRs when villages are sub-divided: This can result in uncertainty, and even conflict, regarding ownership, management responsibility and access rights for a VLFR. There is a need to understand this issue further and for guidance to be developed to support communities in addressing the challenges that can affect CBFM when a village is split.
- Municipalisation of villages: Some villages with VLFRs have been incorporated into municipalities / townships, subsequent to the establishment of CBFM. There is no guidance in place on how this issue should be addressed. There is a need to understand this issue further and for guidance to be developed to avoid deforestation in VLFRs that are re-classified as falling in municipal areas.

- Delays by District Harvesting Committees in issuing harvesting permits: Some communities have experienced financial losses caused by delays in the District Harvesting Committees fulfilling their roles and responsibilities. This undermines communities' capacity to implement CBFM effectively. There is a need to understand this issue further and for guidance to be developed to support communities to benefit from their VLFRs

A consultancy was commissioned to Envex Consulting to undertake research focusing on the above mentioned four key challenges. Objectives of the study were:

1. To describe four governance issues affecting CBFM, including the nature and scale of the problems, their root causes and one or more case study per issue.
2. To generate evidence-based solutions to address the four challenges.
3. To prepare guidelines that address the four CBFM challenges.
4. To generate recommendations for further research around the four CBFM challenges.

The research was implemented by Dr.Dominico Kilemo (Lead Consultant), and Shukuru Nyagawa (Team Member), both of them from Envex Consulting. Key conclusions and recommendations presented during the workshop:

Challenge	Root causes	Scale of the problem	Impact on CBFM	Recommended Solutions
Skills shortages among VNRC members as a result of turnover of VNRC members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure of the CBFM guidelines to state the need to maintain some members from the outgoing committee • Lack of good governance 	Countrywide	Mismanagement VLFRs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support trainings to new members on regular basis • Retaining at least half of outgoing committee members
Impact on VLFRs when villages are sub-divided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population increase • Political interests <p>Case studies: -<i>Ulaya Kibaoni and Ng'ole villages</i> -<i>Kisanga and Wedo villages</i></p>	Countrywide in both CBFM and Non-CBFM villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of Village land use plan • Change of forest management plan • Forest degradation 	Gazettement of VLFRS
Municipalization of villages with VLFRs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population increase • Political interests <p>Cases studies: <i>Lindi municipality, Mikumi Town Council</i></p>	Not clearly known May potentially affect villages countrywide	The villages lose the mandate to manage forests	Review of Forest Act 2002 to recognize hamlet or street forest reserves in urban settings
Delays by District Harvesting Committees in issuing forest produce allocation certificate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GN 417 • Funds for DHC meetings • Availability of District Commissioner (chair of DHC) <p>Case studies : <i>Kilosa</i></p>	Countrywide as long as GN 417 is being implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of revenues by villages • Discouragement to forest produce traders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of GN 417 (give back the mandate to villages) • Advise the DC o delegate the chair position to DAS in case not available

Recommendations for further research:

- The impact of GN 417 on community forest product value chains
- Action research involving the communities in testing different solution pathways for VNRC turnover

- Documentation of different experiences and lessons learnt on village sub-division in relation to CBFM countrywide
- The environmental, economic and social impact of the transition of CBFM to town / municipal forest reserve

2.4.2 Discussion after presentation on good governance challenges

Question: As the title suggests, I expected the study to have covered community forest reserve and private forest reserves. I would like to know if the challenges you mentioned affect other forms of CBFM regime.

Response: TFCG supports CBFM on village land, as such the ToR was specific to village land forest reserves.

Question: According to the existing guidelines, if members of a VNRC are not performing well, they can be removed through the village assembly. However, they are required to train the newly appointed members as part of a succession plan. Then, why should it become a problem that newly appointed VNRC did not have the necessary skills and knowledge required for effective implementation of CBFM plans?

Question: During your presentation, you mentioned that implementation of GN 417 has affected CBFM, did you examine why the government enacted GN 417 which centralized some of the powers which were earlier decentralized to communities?

Response: The study did not cover that, however, this could be another research area worthy looking at.

Question: Upgrading of the villages to town councils / municipalisation is one of the issues mentioned in the presentation. It will add value to the analysis if you could include information on the scale of the problem i.e. to what extent upgrading of the villages has affected CBFM including identifying number of CBFM forests affected so far. Since the consultation process included PORALG, what recommendations were given in addressing this, particularly on how this could be accommodated under township management structure?

Comment: It was advised that, the analysis should focus on principles of good governance. For every challenge which was identified it should be analysed based on the principles of good governance; legitimacy, voice, performance, accountability, fairness and rights. For example, at village level, decisions on CBFM should be approved by village assembly; however, in some circumstances such decisions are approved by only a small portion of the village population due to poor attendance in the village assembly meetings. According to the laws, when a village assembly is postponed two times because of poor attendance, the third time will be held regardless of poor attendance, and those few who attended will have legitimacy to approve plans and decisions pertaining to the whole village. As a result, such decisions / plans lack ownership of the majority of the village population and therefore implementation becomes difficult. The study could have -as well analysed the impact of such laws in CBFM and come with recommendations on how to address this issue.

Comment: The study could have aligned recommendations with root causes of the respective governance challenges so that proposed solutions could be practical. Also, apart from analysing governance challenges, the study could go beyond and include analysis of the extent of the challenges; for example if there are VNRCs who lack the required skills and knowledge –what proportion of them or if there are challenges related to the implementation

of GN 417 –to what extent this has impacted communities etc. In addition to that, it is important to understand the genesis of GN 417 and reflect on the best way forward.

Comment: Poor relationship between VNRC members and corrupt village leaders is one of the major governance challenges in CBFM villages. In some circumstances some of the VNRC members are removed not because of poor performance but because of poor relationship with corrupt village leaders. As of the moment, there is no a mechanism in place that the removed VNRC members can appeal. Though the decision to replace them is approved at the village assembly but because of the influence of corrupt village leaders such VNRC members are normally removed.

Comment: Challenges and recommendations presented do not correlate sufficiently; the study needs to be improved.

Comment: Splitting of the villages or upgrading of the villages to township authorities should not be regarded / viewed as a challenge, as indicated in the presentation. A forest could be managed by more than one village, if the village splits, the same management plan could be used with some few changes annexed particularly those related to management structure and benefit sharing; gazzettment status remains the same and even the name of the forest could remain the same.

Comment: Presentation did not clarify specific sections of the GN 417 which are posing challenges to the implementation of CBFM. It would have been more useful if the analysis could provide, in detail, the sections that are impacting CBFM implementation.

Comment: To what extent existing laws and regulations align to each other? If a village is upgraded to township authority, sub villages become Mtaa/hamlets/streets. Under local Government Act 8 of 1982, when a village land is upgraded to township/municipality, land in the upgraded village falls under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner for Lands. This is contrary to decentralization. In CBFM, communities are designated as managers and owners of the forest resources in their village lands.

Comment: When a village splits, communities can agree on how to manage their forest together as one unit; however, the challenge arises when a village is upgraded to municipality whereby land falls under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner for Lands. Since land is transferred from village land to general land, this affects CBFM arrangements. Our laws and guidelines do not accommodate CBFM in municipalities. This is something that needs dialogue

2.5.0 Charcoal Certification

2.5.1 Research on Charcoal Certification by Dr. Severin Kalonga, EFC Ltd

Presentation is available at: <http://www.tfcg.org/coforest-charcoal-certification-research-2022/>

During Year 1 (2020) of the CoForEST project, a study on charcoal certification was commissioned to include the following:

1. Identifying certification and standards options for charcoal in Tanzania based on a review of the literature and policies, and experiences in other countries and in other value chains in Tanzania;

2. Establishing advantages and disadvantages of different options including national standards covered through the TBS Standards Act #2, 2009 vs voluntary standards such as FSC;
3. Reviewing of FSC status for timber in Tanzania and how or whether charcoal could link with the existing FSC-NFSS;
4. Assessing awareness and attitudes in government MDAs about charcoal certification and standards;
5. Examining the potential for standards and certification to link with the Transforming Tanzania Charcoal Sector (TTCS) model, based on a review of project reports and other materials such as the charcoal manuals and other descriptions of the model.
6. Evaluating other benefits of standards (as well as environmental benefits) including benefits to consumers in setting standards on product quality (particularly on health grounds), weights and measures and legality or compliance.
7. Reviewing lessons learned from the adoption of FSC standards for timber (linking with Mpingo Conservation and Development Initiative - MCDI) and consider modifications that would be required to apply to sustainable charcoal.
8. Analyzing relevant stakeholders in terms of their influence and role in charcoal standards
9. Generating evidence-based recommendations about how charcoal standards and / or certification could contribute to improving the environmental and health outcomes of the charcoal value chain
10. Providing recommendations for further research on charcoal certification.

The study is available at: <http://www.tfcg.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/TFCG-Technical-Paper-46-Charcoal-Certification-in-Tanzania-2020-FINAL.pdf>

The study concluded that:

- Tanzania has a unique opportunity to convert its biomass resource base potential into a sustainable and renewable energy asset through the deployment of certification standards.
- a good policy and legal framework are key to unlocking and exploring this opportunity. Tanzania's existing National Forest Stewardship Standards and the Tanzania Bureau of Standards (TBS) cook stove standards provide a foundation for developing charcoal standards.

Among other the things, the study recommended that the National Forest Stewardship Standards (NFSS) be complemented with TBS compulsory standards and that TBS develop specific standards for charcoal kilns, to include charcoal production process and quality. The study also noted that the TBS Wood Charcoal and Briquettes Standards TZS1312:2020 were under review.

Building on the conclusions of the Year 1 study, the 2021 research addressed four objectives.

1. To assess the feasibility of linking National Forest Stewardship Standards with TBS compulsory standards with a detailed focus on the charcoal value chain (institutions, processes).
2. To investigate and present options for a TBS standard on charcoal kilns, production, quality and species for sustainable charcoal production.
3. To assess the feasibility and profitability of applying of TBS Standard TZS 1312:2020 to sustainable charcoal produced in the CoForEST project area.

4. To recommend measures that could be taken by the CoForEST project partners and other stakeholders to promote progress on charcoal certification to support socially inclusive and ecologically sustainable charcoal value chains.

The research was implemented by Dr. Severin Kalonga, International forest management and environment certification expert from Environment and Forest Certification Limited (EFC Ltd)

Key conclusions from the 2021 research presented during the workshop:

- FSC NFSS are voluntary in nature. To ensure effective implementation of charcoal certification in CBFM areas in Tanzania, they should be made compulsory.
- The TBS standard on charcoal kilns, production, quality and species aims at improving production efficiency (e.g., carbonization) and quality of charcoal.
- The lump charcoal from the CoForEST village kiln, that was tested, revealed that it did not have the required qualities as per TBS Standard (TZS 1312:2010), and hence unsuitable for household use.
- despite the interests of stakeholders in certification, there is limited awareness and capacity for implementation of charcoal certification in Tanzania.

Recommendations

- development of training programs for sensitization and capacity building
- one of the challenges was inadequate awareness and limited market. To ensure that certified charcoal is profitable, a strategy to reshape the market and consumer behaviour is inevitable.
- the FSC - NFSS should be linked to TBS standards to give it legal force during its implementation on the ground
- three charcoal producer groups VLFRs in Kilosa district could be considered for certification as a pilot project for capacity building

Proposed action plan in annex 1

2.5.2 Discussion after presentation on charcoal certification

Comment: Apart from awareness there is an issue of political will that needs to be addressed. Certification features in the national frameworks (NFIS, National CBFM action plan etc) but it is important that a political will is cultivated among policy and decision makers to enhance implementation. Also, we need a forum /platform where all the relevant stakeholders can discuss on how the existing tools can help spearheading the direction of the forestry sector. The



sector has so many challenges and has a lot of stakeholders, it is important that stakeholders dialogue on how to increase contribution of the sector to the national economy.

Comment: Certification is a tool that can help improve forest ecology and increase contribution of the forestry sector to the economy. At the moment charcoal certification is voluntary and internal market has charcoal from many sources. In order to access external markets charcoal needs to be certified. In Tanzania, there is an export ban for charcoal. Charcoal contributes 44% of the revenue from forestry sector. TAFORI conducted a national study and the findings indicated that 90% of the charcoal is illegal. This means that the government is losing a lot of revenue. If charcoal export ban is waived this can create market opportunities for certified charcoal. TAFORI is a member of the task force for developing the national charcoal strategy, among other things the taskforce will look into the possibility of getting an avenue for exporting charcoal which will also include charcoal from plantations.

Question: Are there countries that have developed charcoal standards and are implementing so that we can learn from them?

Response: Certification is new in our country and has started gaining momentum in recent years. There are countries that have been successful in exporting certified charcoal to Europe, e.g. Namibia and Australia.

Question: According to a study conducted in March 2021, in Kilwa, with involvement of MCDI, it indicated that the management costs for certified forests are 2.6 times the revenue. If this is the case, it means that revenues will not be sufficient to cover management costs and therefore communities will not be able to implement their management plans.

Response: Certification is value addition and obviously increases cost. Unfortunately, at the moment, we have a challenge that most of our consumers cannot differentiate certified and uncertified forest products. We need to change the mind set of our consumers so that they understand why they should opt for certified products. However, regarding the cost of management, it is more of the issue of perception, as of the moment we do not have a very informed cost benefit analysis, we still have scant information. Regarding the MCDI study, the issue is on the sample size, the challenge is that, only a small proportion of the certified forest area is generating revenue from certified timber so management costs will obviously be higher. There is a good example of certified community forest management in Latin America with very high return on investment. So the challenge with MCDI is that forest areas under community management are extensive while revenue from certified timber comes from only a small area.

Question: Why did the study focus on charcoal certification instead of forest products in general? It would make more sense if certification includes all products from forests under CBFM regime.

Question: Did the sampling frame include consumers –as they are the ones who are affected by the price of the certified products.

Response: Consultation process included diverse stakeholders including consumers, and in the overall they had a perception that consumers do not recognize certified products and that awareness is important in order to change consumers' behaviour.

2.6.0 CBFM Financing

Presentation is available at: <http://www.tfcg.org/coforest-sustainable-financing-research-2022/>

2.6.1 Research on CBFM Financing by Dr. Perfect Mrema, UDSM

With the recent emergence of sustainable forest-based enterprises including timber and charcoal in CBFM areas, there has been growing interest in developing CBFM financing models that connect with these enterprises. This trend is not restricted to Tanzania and the mechanics of community forestry are emerging as an important research frontier.

During Year 1 of the CoForEST project, stakeholders identified five key areas of research in relation to sustainable financing for CBFM:

1. Review existing domestic and international CBFM funding opportunities
2. Examine the possibility of linking existing CBFM interventions with payment for environmental services
3. Assess capacity at different levels for fundraising for CBFM
4. Assess innovative models for financing CBFM
5. Evaluate costs for establishing and sustaining CBFM

In 2020, a first study was commissioned to address the first four (1-4) key areas. As such, the objectives of the study were:

1. Review existing domestic and international CBFM funding opportunities for scaling up and sustaining CBFM
2. Analyse different mechanisms for local government authorities in allocating resources to provide longterm support, including through the use of revenues from CBFM areas
3. Analyse different mechanisms for central government in allocating resources to provide long-term support for communities in managing CBFM, including through TFS and / or FBD
4. Analyse the barriers to local and central-government financing for providing long-term support to manage VLFRs
5. Make recommendations around the changes that can be made that would result in LGAs spending resources on supporting CBFM and scaling-up CBFM
6. Propose innovative models for financing CBFM

Key conclusions from the 2020 CoForEST research on sustainable financing for Community-Based Forest Management were:

- Financing is an important aspect in ensuring the sustainability of Community Based Forest Management (CBFM).
- There is a need to expand and diversify financing mechanisms and sources of finances in order to sustainably manage the established CBFM and also scale up CBFM in other areas.
- There are existing potential financing mechanisms from different stakeholders.
- The current financing of CBFM is mainly donor-dependent, inadequate, unreliable and unsustainable. Tanzania Government should take her responsibility to finance the forests including those under CBFM.
- Both Local Government Authorities and Central Government should have positive attitudes towards financing of CBFM by allocating adequate budget for the same. Development partners on the other hand, should only supplement to the Government

effort, contrary to the current situations where the development partners are the leading supporters of management of CBFM.

- There is a need to review some of the forest-related guidelines and regulations so as to give forest sector (including CBFM) the importance it deserves. (BACAS, 2021).

The study included recommendations for further research:

Establishing facts and figures on activities that are involved in implementing CBFM, costs involved in establishing CBFM, costs involved in managing CBFM, products and quantities harvested from CBFM forests, revenues accrued from such harvests and uses of revenues accrued. This will form the basis for bargaining and justification on funds being sought from various sources to sustain CBFM. Gathering facts/figures for CBFM will help convince the central government/district councils/village governments to put CBFM as a priority during budgeting just like it is with other sectors such as education, health and water.

The recommendation to further investigate CBFM costs and revenues, is aligned with the initial stakeholder recommendation to evaluate costs for establishing and sustaining CBFM and provides the basis for the consultancy described in these terms of reference.

In response to recommendations provided in Year 1, a study was conducted for the purpose of determining the financial sustainability of the CoForEST CBFM model and identifies lessons learned for CBFM development in Tanzania.

The research was implemented by Dr. Aloyce Hepelwa, Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics and Business expert from University of Dar es Salaam (Lead Consultant) and Dr. Joseph Perfect Mrema, Senior Lecturer from University of Dar es Salaam (Team Member)

The study addressed the following objectives:

- To describe the economics of charcoal and timber production for individual producers.
- To document community-level revenues and revenue flows from CBFM case study villages.
- To document expenditure patterns in CBFM case studies.
- To identify opportunities and challenges with the current model with a focus on the financial sustainability of the model and potential for scaling-up.
- To present lessons learned and recommendations

Key conclusions of the Year 2 (2021) research presented in the workshop:

- Charcoal production was in good condition up to the year 2018, where the number of villagers participating in the production was large resulting to realization of large quantity of charcoal and high income to producers.
- However, since 2019, charcoal business has been declining due to low charcoal demand in the study villages resulting to fewer registered charcoal producers participating in the charcoal production activities, low quantity of charcoal produced and hence low income to producers.
- Charcoal business still remains profitable to traders and producers, when the final trade is at Dar es Salaam market, where prices are relatively higher.
- Contribution of charcoal income to producers is relatively low compared to what is expected by individual charcoal producers who produce and sell charcoal within the village.
- The per capita income has remained around TZS 230,000 per person per year. This amount is relatively small for producers to sustain expenditures to fulfil essential

household needs. This is likely to be a disincentive to individual producers to participate in charcoal production.

- Producers are faced with challenges such as lack of marketing skills and capital to transport charcoal to reach potential market such as Dar es Salaam.
- Individual producer's ability to trade at Dar es Salaam market would be an opportunity to gain more income and motivation to participate in charcoal production. This will reduce dependency on unreliable registered charcoal buyers who are not visiting respective villages to buy charcoal as needed
- The current state of declining revenue indicates unhealthy state to community development as well as the sustainability of forest resources

Recommendations

Recommendations on production enhancement, increased market access and cost dilution are put forward for consideration to enhance the sustainable forest-based enterprise in project villages

- a group of producers to be facilitated through provision of low-cost credit during the initial take off to participate in the market value chain;
- facilitate Creation and Piloting of Production – sales link (PSL) model. There is a need to have a mechanism to empower producers to sell charcoal in large markets. To achieve the CBFM substantiable financing goal, it is imperative to connect stakeholders in the key charcoal/timber value chain nodes of the production and large markets (Dar es Salaam market).

Areas for further research

- Charcoal and Timber Value Chain Modalities in the project villages
- Opportunities and Challenges for Timber Production and Business in the project villages
- Governance challenges facing the project financial model.
- Entrepreneurship, Marketing and Capital options in the project villages
- Study of the Policy and Regulatory framework with emphasis on Charcoal and Timber production in CBFM villages
- A comparative study of Charcoal and Timber production in project villages and non-project villages with focus on financial sustainability

2.6.2 Discussion after presentation on CBFM Financing

Question: Where to scale up should be part of the agenda when discussing CBFM scaling up. Work needs to be done in identifying areas where CBFM can be scaled up including estimates of the available forest areas. This information is important in promoting CBFM and influencing discussions on CBFM scaling up.

Response: At national level we have conserved about 40% of the total forest area; however there are potential forest areas on village land which are not under proper management. Mapping those areas for scaling up CBFM is important. In addition to that, scaling up the model in other CBFM areas should be promoted. There are CBFM areas which do not include a component for sustainable harvesting for charcoal and or timber in their management plans.

Comment: Presentation provided information on cost benefit analysis without clearly showing how this links with sustainable financing for CBFM including opportunities for CBFM financing. As the title suggests, it was expected that the research would propose potential financing options for sustaining and scaling up CBFM. Identifying possible areas for scaling up is also important as mentioned earlier.



Response: The study focused more on the economic analysis of the model as per specific objectives of the research. As such, the ToR for this assignment focused on production efficiency, revenue to the villages and to producers, challenges and opportunities and lessons learned in order to analyse economic feasibility and return on investment. Research findings could be used for lobbying and advocacy for promoting more investment in CBFM.

Comment: The analysis has linked revenues to the villages with GN 417; as such it shows clearly how implementation of the GN 417 has impacted revenues. From 2019 revenue to the villages has dropped and therefore affecting the villages in implementing forest management activities and development projects.

Response: One of the possibility could be through addressing market issues for example by linking producers with urban markets instead of relying on traders who come to buy charcoal in the villages and also lobbying by demonstrating impact of the model to producers and to the villages and in improving forest management -this may influence policy and regulatory changes.

2.7.0 Impact of GN 417

2.7.1 Presentation on Empirical Evidence of the Impact of GN 417 by Cassian Sianga, TFWG

Presentation is available at: <http://www.tfcg.org/coforest-tfwg-cbfm-research-2022/>

TFCG in collaboration with TFWG sought to conduct an in-depth investigation of the impact of GN 417 in CBFM implementation and development. The study will culminate into the development of the policy brief on the impact of GN 417 on CBFM and forest based enterprises for sharing with policy and decision makers, while at the same communicating the message to the general public through media.

As such, a 12 day rapid assessment was carried out by involving a technical team from TFWG, TFCG and journalists from different media houses. The assessment focused on the following key issues; reallocation of responsibility for the preparation of village land forest reserve harvesting plans from the village council to the Director of Forestry, reallocation of responsibility for issuing harvesting permits in VLFRs from the village council to the District Forest Produce Harvesting Committee, and the right to set harvesting fees for forest produce.

In addition, the team evaluated relationship of the various forest stakeholders particularly the village governments and district authorities (TFS, DFO and DED), village councils and other village institutions i.e VNRC, VLUM.

Objective(s) of the study:

1. The main objective of the assessment was to document concrete evidence of the impact of GN 417 on CBFM and forest-based enterprises. The ultimate aim of the assignment was to engage other stakeholders in the forestry industry promote policy dialogue and contribute to sustainable utilization and management of forestry resources in Tanzania.
2. Documentation and analysis of CBFM revenue records before and after GN 417 was enacted and its impact to charcoal traders and community motivation in engaging in CBFM.

3. Evidences on the invitation of the CBFM communities to participate in the District Harvesting Committee meetings and inflexibility of the meetings.

Conclusions and recommendations

- GN 417 is still posing the challenges mentioned in this report, therefore it is recommended that the Government through the Ministry of Natural Resource revise the regulation especially on the sections which are controversial.
- uniform levies for traders who buy goods from villages that implement CBFM and those who buy from open land forest reserves was not mentioned in the GN 417. Regulation 7 of the GN 417 has provided that, for a person to be considered and be granted with a license, he/she has to pay appropriate fees as prescribed in the Forest Regulations, 2004. However, the regulations have not taken into consideration the restriction provided under Part II of the 2017 regulations which restricts the prescribed fees to be paid for forest produce cut by a Government licensee from Government owned forest reserves and general land only. In terms of the 2017 regulations the prescribed fees are inapplicable to village land forests. Again, the Forest Regulation of 2004 has mentioned the fees of TZS 600 per bag of charcoal of 28 kg, the basis for the rate of 12,500 which has been established seem to be unclear.
- powers granted to the village councils for management of the village land forest reserves are a creature of the Forest Act as stipulated in section 49 (1) have the mandate to issuing permit. Therefore, it is recommended that, any matter relating to issuance of permits or licenses for harvesting forest products from villages with village management plans be reserved to the respective villages only. However, the District Committee should be notified of the decision reached thereof for noting.
- number of meetings to discuss and grant or refuse to issue permits and licenses be increased to at least two per annum. This will allow more traders to apply for permits.



2.7.2 Discussion after presentation on Empirical Evidence of the Impact of GN 417

Comment: According to the forest regulations, 5% of the revenue collected by TFS from forest on village land should be returned to the district for supporting forest management. A study could be conducted to find out how much has been remitted and how local authorities have spent the funds -to see if the districts have used remitted funds to support forest management activities.

Question: Guidelines state that, TFS Chief Executive Office shall recommend best charcoal production techniques, and producers shall be required to use the recommended technologies. And if a producer use technologies other than those recommended will be breaching the laws. As of the moment are there recommended technologies for charcoal production?

Response: So far TFS has not provided guidelines on charcoal production technologies to be used for charcoal production in the country.

Comment: PORALG is still working on the issue of PLANREP, this will help to secure funds for forest management including for scaling up CBFM. Under this system funds will be ring fenced, however this process will take some time.

Comment: During the latest TFWG meeting, members agreed to develop a policy brief on key issues pertaining existing laws and regulations and findings from various researches conducted by TFCG /MJUMITA, MDCI, FORVAC, TNRF and others for the purpose of sharing with policy and decision markers.

2.8.0 Remarks from the Workshop Participants

2.8.1 DNRO, Kilosa district

This event has been an important opportunity for stakeholders to hear and discuss research findings and recommendations. As advised by the participants of the workshop, it is important that research results are packaged in a simplified way and a mechanism is devised to ensure that this information reaches communities in the grass root so that they are informed and can use the findings to improve CBFM implementation. Some of the studies were conducted in Year 1 such as the ecological monitoring; unfortunately the findings of this research have not reached communities so that they could take actions accordingly. Experience shows that district councils are not disbursing funds for supporting CBFM scaling up; PLANREP can help ring fence funds allocated for CBFM, therefore it is important that PORALG fast track this process so that funds for supporting CBFM could be secured.

2.8.2 District Land and Natural Resource Officer, Morogoro district

I would like to congratulate the consultants for doing a wonderful job; the findings and recommendations provided by these researches are very important and will help the districts and communities to improve the implementation process.

2.8.3 District Planning Officer, Mvomero district

I would like to thank the organizers of this research workshop; this has been an important opportunity to learn and share experience, the research results provide substantial inputs in the development of our districts. As a Planning Officer I have seen the importance of including funds for CBFM in the code for development project, forty percent of the revenue in our district is allocated for development projects, it is therefore important that, CBFM related activities including scaling up are put in this category / code and not in the code for other/ normal activities, because priority is normally given to development projects.

2.8.4 District Planning Officer, Liwale district

I thank the organizers of this workshop; I would like to advise that, awareness raising is conducted to the District Executive Directors and other district leaders so that they are well informed of the importance of allocating and disbursing funds for CBFM activities and scaling up.

2.8.5 District Forest Officer, Ruangwa district

This has been a very important event and has provided an opportunity to hear the research findings and share experience. I would like to insist that, it is important that the ten percent of the village revenues collected by the districts to be separated from other district collections,

this could help secure funds for sustaining and scaling up CBFM. However, for this to happen, PORALG should intervene.

2.8.6 Representative, Nachingwea district

It is important that PORALG intervene in this, as we all know that there has been a challenge in allocating and disbursing funds for supporting CBFM. Having a mechanism in place for allocating and disbursing funds for sustaining and scaling up CBFM is important.

2.8.7 Representative, MCDI

I would like to thank presenters and organizers of this workshop; the project research component has been important in providing evidence based arguments. The findings and recommendations presented in the workshop will help implementers in improving the implementation of the project.

2.8.8 Representative, TAFORI

On behalf of my colleagues from TAFORI I would like to thank TFCG and MJUMITA for organizing this workshop and for inviting TAFORI in the workshop. I would also like to congratulate presenters for such a wonderful job. I would request that, if these reports will be published to be shared with TAFORI, I also understand that some of these researches are providing baselines which will be used in future in measuring changes. These researches contribute to the National Forestry Research Programme 2020-2030 which involve various stakeholders including NGOs. I would like to advise stakeholders to continue researching the impact of GN 417 to the implementation of CBFM including its contribution and provide evidence based recommendations. Independent evaluation of the positive and negative impacts of GN 417 would be important in informing policy and decision makers and other relevant stakeholders so that corrective actions could be taken. For those who are not familiar with TAFORI, this is a research institute established in 1980 with the Forest Act No. 5, TAFORI is responsible for supervising and coordinating forestry researches; according to the guidelines issued by the government in 2020, require researchers to be registered to TAFORI and register the researches so that they could be recognized by the government. COSTECH has so far issued directives for formulating research committees which will be responsible for reviewing and registering researches. The committees will be constituted by various stakeholders including from NGOs, research and academic institutions and all the research reports will be deposited in a database where different people could access. I would request researchers to register (as may not be aware of the existence of this structure/arrangement); they could visit our website for more information on how to register. The coordinator for registration is Dr. Amani Uisso who is also here in this workshop.

2.8.9 RNRO, Lindi

I would like to thank the organizers of this workshop; Lindi is one of the regions that have been doing well in implementing CBFM and is one of the leading regions in CBFM, so I would like to invite researchers and other stakeholders to our region for the purpose of learning and sharing experience. The new CBFM model that has been introduced by the project is promising and has been welcomed very well with stakeholders at the regional level, district level and village level. I would advise that research results and recommendations are packaged in simplified way so that could be easily understood by the communities.

2.8.10 RNRO, Iringa

I would like to commend researchers and organizers of this workshop; the findings and recommendations need to be translated to implementation so that could benefit the target

group/communities in the grass root. However, I would propose more research on carbon financing as the findings could help communities benefit from carbon sales. Just for your information, the Regional Commissioner will visit the project village /Mahenge in the next week to learn and see how communities are implementing the project model.

2.8.11 TFS, Morogoro

I would like to thank the researchers involved in the various studies presented and organizers of this workshop and participants for inputs. Awareness raising is important particularly in implementing the existing laws and regulations and also continue advocating for policy and regulatory changes where necessary in order to create a more favourable environment for CBFM implementation.

2.8.12 Representative, MNRT/FBD

It is important that inputs from stakeholders are reflected in the research reports and circulated to stakeholders as soon as possible. Also it is important that research summaries are prepared and shared with stakeholders including at national level. I would like to advise consultants to ensure that their researches are balanced. The research committees could be used to review the findings and recommendations so as to avoid biasness in the reports, this could make the reports qualify to be used at the national level including in the relevant government ministries. It is important to find the best way to summarize deliberations / resolutions of this important workshop and share with key ministries, regional secretariats and LGAs.

2.8.13 Remarks from TFCG by Nike Doggart, TFCG Technical Advisor

She thanked all the presenters for excellent research and for their willingness to communicate their findings and recommendations over the last two days. She also thanked the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation for the resources they have provided to finance the research; TAFORI for allowing the project to hold the meeting in their facilities; and Ewald for coordinating the research workshop. The research topics were identified in the stakeholders' consultation process during the design of the CoForEST Project. As a result, the project has benefited from the wisdom and findings of independent experts from Tanzanian research institutes including USDM, SUA and TAFORI. Over the last two days, the importance of raising the forestry sector contribution to the national economy has been discussed. Given the enormous value of the charcoal market the project set out to demonstrate how charcoal can contribute back to the management of the forest. Dr Mugasha has then demonstrated the extent of the forest resources that remain on village land. These are opportunities for the forest sector, and we have seen from Prof. Jeckoniah and Prof. Augustino that CBFM on village land can also play an important role in achieving gender equity and gender equality, and certification as one way to increase the quality of charcoal and other forest products in CBFM as Dr. Kalonga has shown. Dr. Hepelwa and Dr. Perfect have shown the potential financial sustainability of the charcoal model. The experts have presented at this workshop and also demonstrated that over the last two to three years something has not been quite on track. The model, that so much has been invested in, is no longer delivering the intended level of revenue to the communities, and the tensions around the model have yet to be resolved. If communities are not supported to benefit from their forests they will convert the forests to agriculture. Dr. Mugasha and Dr, Hepelwa have shown this clearly. If communities are not supported communities to benefit from their forests, they will continue to be converted to crops where the direct benefits to the communities are very clear. As forestry stakeholders our challenge is to see how we can address this situation and this is the challenge the academics have presented clearly in this workshop. The evidence and discussions from this workshop are intended to contribute to the discussions on the

forestry sector, and by working together we can achieve sustainable and valuable forest management.

2.8.14 Remarks from TFCG by Charles Leonard, Project Manager on behalf of TFCG Assistant Director

He thanked participants for actively taking part in the workshop. In his remarks he ascertained that, during the two days of the meeting participants had time to discuss on the findings and recommendations presented by the researchers and provided inputs to improve the research results. The project has been implementing its activities in a participatory manner and that all the relevant stakeholders have been involved in the implementation process. He urged participants to collaborate with the project in implementing recommendations provided by the researchers so that the findings could contribute to the overall goal of the project. He added that, through the project capacity building interventions to NGOs, LGAs, regional secretariats and at national level were conducted. It is believed that, all key stakeholders have the capacity to implement the model and promote scaling up even after the project has ended. He then thanked participants for participating in the workshop.

2.8.15 Closing remarks, Sanford Kway, PORALG

In his remarks he thanked organizers of the workshop, SDC for funding the project, researchers who presented during the workshop and participants for active participation during the two days of the workshop. He commented that, the research component is costly and it is important that knowledge generated is used to inform CBFM implementation processes including policy decisions. Non-governmental organizations have an important role to play in advocating for policy and regulatory changes. He urged the project to prepare policy briefs that can be shared with various stakeholders including policy and decision makers as this could be an appropriate and effective way of communicating the research findings. There is a need to refine some of the findings as per the inputs provided during the workshop so that the studies could bring more contribution. TFCG and MJUMITA are doing quite a good job; it is important that the project initiatives are sustained and promoted after the project has ended; this is what was agreed between the Hon. Ambassador and the government when the Swiss government committed to support the project.

Annex 1: Proposed action plan, Charcoal Certification

Fundamental Measures	Interventions needed	Responsible	Collaborating stakeholders	Timeframe
Awareness creation among stakeholders on FC (FSC and TBS standards)	Sensitization to government officials, charcoal producer groups and community at large through various media on certification and standards and their requirements	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., TFCG, MDCI, WWF, AFF, FSC Africa, etc), Development Partners	Government (FBD/TFS, TBS, Academic Institutions, etc) MDAs	2022-2025
	Promote SFM activities to make it easier for communities, companies, later to adopt certification and standards, in order to accelerate FC	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., TFCG, MDCI, WWF, AFF, FSC Africa, etc), Development Partners	Government (FBD/TFS, TBS, Academic Institutions, etc) MDAs	2022-2025
	TBS technical committee to visit charcoal production sites to identify the whole procedure deployed for SCP (and gaps if any) so as to inform the process for developing standards for charcoal kilns specifications	TBS	Government (FBD), LGAs, Private sector, NGOs/CSOs (TFCG, MDCI, WWF) MDAs	2022
	Inform authorities of the existence and importance of certification and standards in the forest sector	MNRT (FBD)	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., TFCG, MDCI, WWF, AFF, FSC Africa), Development Partners,	2022

	(including launch of NFSS)		private sector	
	Sustainability: Demonstrate the benefits of FC for SFM to stakeholders; Propose arrangements for learning excursions to areas with certified forests, e.g., Namibia, Mkaa Endelevu - Mafinga	TFCG	Certificate holders (private sector), NGOs/CSOs (e.g., MDCI, WWF, AFF, FSC Africa, etc), Development Partners	2022
	Encourage participants to build awareness on FC in their areas, and Sensitise stakeholders on the demand for certified products in the local and international markets, e.g., Value addition (Lump Charcoal to Briquettes)	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., TFCG, MDCI, WWF, AFF, FSC Africa, etc), Development Partners	Government MDAs (FBD/TFS, TBS, Academic Institutions, etc), Private sector	2022-2025
	Engage key players in the policy and legislative operationalization processes to understand how FC helps and benefits the local communities and national economy, and hence include certification among the potential interventions in forest management	TFCG	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., MDCI, WWF, AFF, FSC Africa, etc), Private sector, Government MDAs (FBD/TFS, TBS, PPRA)	2022-2025
	Formalization or registration (by the government) of charcoal producer groups	Producer groups	LGAs, SIDO	2022

	as business entities with support from SIDO, coach them on proper document control, planning and business skills			
	Develop and establish certified charcoal 'Market centres'	TFCG	Community Producer groups, Private sector, LGAs, Government MDAs (TFS/FBD, PPRA, PFPII, FORVAC)	2022-2025
Capacity building in FC	Promote the inclusion of FC in forestry curricula (FC in the existing forestry syllabus) in all relevant academic institutions, and emphasize it to make students appreciate its importance	MNRT (FBD)	Academic Institutions, NGOs/CSOs (e.g., MDCI, WWF, AFF, FSC Africa, etc), Private sector, Government MDAs (TBS, PPRA)	2022-2025
	Initiation of FSC Group Certification Scheme for VLFRs - FM/CoC - Certification process: Gap analysis against the FSC Standards (FM/CoC), and address all the gaps identified before applying for certification	TFCG	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., MDCI, WWF, FSC Africa), LGAs, Producer groups, Development Partners	2022
Mobilise forest resource owners and/or managers to participate in FC	Mobilizing local communities and CBOs into groups for FC, i.e., partnering with groups that are interested in promoting	TFCG	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., MDCI, WWF, AFF, FSC Africa, etc), Private sector, LGAs and Regional Secretariats,	2022-2025

	FC among forest owners, managers, users (Design projects aimed at helping local communities to be organized and apply for certification)		Government MDAs (TBS, FBD/TFS)	
	Training and capacity building to ensure sustainable funding for the FSC scheme (business skills, planning, etc)	TFCG	Obuntu Hub (https://obuntuhub.co.tz)	2022
	Interested parties, willingly allocate resources, human, financial and time; and ensure they adhere to the FSC principles and criteria, once certified	Formal Groups	FSC Group Certification Manager, Technical service provider	2022-2023
Highlight the role of research in FC	Promote research studies in FC, such as cost-benefit analyses of FC	TFCG	Research institutions, Consulting firms	2022
	Identify scientists as key players to collaborate in driving forward the certification process	TFCG	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., MCDI, WWF, AFF, FSC Africa, etc), Private sector, Government MDAs (TBS, FBD/TFS)	2022
	Further analyses of various certification schemes and standards to make future informed decision	TFCG	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., MCDI, WWF, AFF, FSC Africa, etc), Private sector, Government MDAs (TBS, FBD/TFS)	2022

Integrate FC into national forest policies	Incorporate certification requirements in policies ensuring SFM, i.e., influence inclusion of FC clauses in national forest policies, and prepare guidelines and standards to certify potential forests and products	MNRT (FBD)	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., TFCG, MCDI, WWF), LGAs, Producer groups, Government MDAs (TBS, TFS) Development Partners	2022-2025
	'Export Ban' for Lump charcoal - advocate for certified lump charcoal from natural forests be exported (Charcoal Strategy should state ' <i>sustainably produced charcoal from Natural Forests can be exported</i> ').	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., TFCG, MCDI, WWF), LGAs, Producer groups, Private sector, Development Partners	Government MDAs (TBS, PPRA, TFS/FBD, Industry & Trade)	2022
	Technology and innovation - Kiln standards to be developed, Pilot mobile kilns in collaboration with Mkaa Endelevu and PFPII.	TFCG	Community Producer groups, Private sector (Mkaa Endelevu), LGAs, Government MDAs (TFS/FBD, TIRDO/TBS, PFPII, FORVAC), NGOs/CSOs (e.g., AFF, MCDI, WWF)	2022
	Tenure for land, trees and forests	Government MDAs (TFS/FBD, Agriculture, Lands),	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., AFF, MCDI, WWF), Private sector, Development Partners	2022-2025
	Involve governments and other stakeholders in the	NGOs/CSOs (e.g.,	Government MDAs	2022-2025

	process of FC (Political will and commitment)	TFCG, MCDI, WWF),	(FBD/TFS, TBS, PPRA), LGAs, Private sector, Development Partners	
	Clearly defined certification incentives - social, economic and environmental	TFCG	Government MDAs (FBD/TFS, PPRA, Industry and Trade)	2022-2025
	Policy documents in place with clauses that support the process of certification, i.e., Incorporate aspects of certification within our policies on forestry, i.e. provisions on FC	MNRT (FBD)	NGOs/CSOs (e.g., AFF, MCDI, WWF), Private sector, Development Partners,	2022-2025
	Market access: Market and market structure for certified products.	PPRA	Private sector, NGOs/CSOs, Development Partners	2021-2025

Annex 2. List of participants

NAME	INSTITUTION	EMAIL-ADDRESS	WHATSAPP NUMBER
WAHIDA S. BELEKO	MOROGORO DC	wahidasalim385@gmail.com	0718806134
JOHN R. MTIMBANJAYO	KILOSA DC	mtimba2008@yahoo.com	0713654869
PETER IBRAHIM	TFCG-MOROGORO	mtoropeter@gmail.com	0717780010
LILIAN D. KATO	LIWALE DC	liliandeu70@gmail.com	0716235584
CHARLES MSONGE	MCDI	charlesmsonge@mpingoconservation.org	0719748320
JAMES N. KABUTTA	RUANGWA DC	jameskabutta@yahoo.com	0623728443
BETTIE LUWUGE	TFCG	bettienanyonio76@gmail.com	0754479766
ELIDA FUNDI	MJUMITA	elidaf@mjumita.org	0784835326
THOMAS MALIMA	SUA Msc. FORUM	malimathomas@gmail.com	0715794316
CLOPHAS MVUNGI	ITU	clophasflavian@gmail.com	0719322127
Dr. GOLYAMA BAHATI	RS-IRINGA	tibagolyama@gmail.com	0765520033
AVELINA MACLAUD	MVOMERO DC	avelinamaclaud@yahoo.com	0678187037
DANIEL J. MALLYA	MOROGORO DC	ujohndan818@gmail.com	0687352428
SEVERINE GREGORY	KILOSA DC	gregyseverine@gmail.com	0656677339
SANFORD KWAY	PORALC	kwaysanford@gmail.com	0754290074
AMANI UISSO	TAFORI MOROGORO	uissoaj@yahoo.com	0754989507
KAJENJE MAGESSA	SUA	kajenjes@yahoo.com	0679502123
GRACE CHOGOGWE	KILOSA DC	gchogogwe02@gmail.com	0784632516
EVANS POLIN	NACHINGWEA DC	polincevansi@gmail.com	0737592665
SALIFU E. VENANCE	MOROGORO DC	salifuelias66@gmail.com	0752103091
MILKAJANE SANGIWA	SUA	mjsangiwa@yahoo.com	0716040042
THADEI T.RUGAMBWA	SUA	thadeirugambwa@gmail.com	0744009707
PASCHAL H. UBAZI	SUA	paschalubazi@gmail.com	0752262016
DEMA Z. KATANI	SUA	demakatani@gmail.com	0767402050
RAMIA ABDULKADIRI	SUA	abdulkadiriramiah@gmail.com	0714374725

MARIANA A. NGOLE	SUA	ngolemariana@gmail.com	0763850282
CHRISTIAN ARISTERIUS	SUA	aristeriusc@gmail.com	0683331744
EMMANUEL MWASILU	SUA	emwasilu9@gmail.com	0754815157
SELEBONI JOHN	MNRT	selebonijohn01@gmail.com	0784545087
Dr. SEVERINE KALONGA	EFC Ltd	severinkalonga@gmail.com	0715432375
TUNU S. UTAWANGU	TFCG	tunuutawangu10@yahoo.com	0683789009
CASSIAN SIANGA	TNRF	c.sianga@tnrf.org	0756960496
ZAWADI J. JILALA	RS-LINDI	zawadi.jilala@lindi.og.12/zilala@yahoo.com	0786620279
Dr. JOSEPH PERFECT	LECTURE-UDSM	josephperfect@gmail.com	0686256735
HAPPY MICHAEL	R.ASSISTANT-TAFORI	happymichael192@gmail.com	0754433036
NANYIKA KINGAZI	R.OFFICER-TAFORI	nanyikakingazi63@gmail.com	0757040819
VUMILIA NONDO	ABOUD MEDIA	yumikondo@gmail.com	0654132346
EWALD GERVAS EMIL	TFCG	emily_gervas@yahoo.com	0754966490
SIMON LUGAZO	TFCG	slugazo@tfcg.or.tz	0714793417
Prof. JOHN JECKONIAH	MOROGORO-SUA	jjeckoniah@sua.ac.tz	0754632289
Dr. WILSON MUGASHA	MOROGORO-SUA	Wilson.mugasha@sua.ac.tz	0713328780
Dr. DOMINICO KILEMO	ENVEX CONSULTING	dbkilemo@sua.ac.tz	0757370856
MSIFWAKI N.HAULE	MVOMERO DC	felistahaule@gmail.com	0714933464
SIA NGAO	MVEOMERO DC	siaangao@gmail.com	0715756633
CHELESTIONO BALAMA	TAFORI MOROGORO	balamapc@gmail.com	0767404873
EDWARD KIMWERY	MVOMERO DC	ekimwery@yahoo.com	0713843131
CHRISTOPHER ASSENGA	TFS-MOROGORO	assengachristo@yahoo.com	0754958901

Annex 3. Photos



